



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/727,191	11/30/2000	Shawn Bracewell	MS150809.1	5607

27195 7590 07/23/2004

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP  
24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER  
1900 EAST NINTH STREET  
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER

JACOBS, LASHONDA T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2157

DATE MAILED: 07/23/2004

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

8

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/727,191

Applicant(s)

BRACEWELL ET AL.

SL

Examiner

LaShonda T. Jacobs

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 May 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 2157

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

This Office Action is in response to Applicants' Request for Reconsideration filed on May 5, 2004. Claims 1-41 are presented for further examination.

### *Claim Objections*

1. Claim 8 is objected to because of the following informalities: trademarks are not allowed in the claims. Appropriate correction is required.
- 2.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Courts et al (hereinafter, "Courts", 6,076,108).

As per claims 1, 35 and 36, Courts discloses a system to facilitate a remote user accessing an application across a stateless protocol comprising:

- a component for caching data associated with the remote user access, the data comprising state and/or user specific information (abstract, col. 1, lines 45-62, col. 9, lines 1-11, lines 63-67 and col. 10, lines 1-18).

Art Unit: 2157

As per claims **22** and **38**, Courts discloses a method for facilitating remote access to an application, the access occurring across a stateless protocol, comprising:

- allocating memory to cache state and/or user specific information associated with the remote access (col. 6, lines 31-39, col. 7, lines 43-51, lines 59-67 and col. 8, lines 1-32);
- caching the state information associated with the remote access of the application in the allocated memory (col. 6, lines 31-39, col. 7, lines 43-51, lines 59-67 and col. 8, lines 1-32); and
- caching the user specific information associated with the remote access of the application in the allocated memory (col. 6, lines 31-39, col. 7, lines 43-51, lines 59-67 and col. 8, lines 1-32).

As per claims **2** and **37**, Courts discloses:

- component for managing memory storing the state and/or user specific information (abstract, col. 1, lines 45-62, col. 9, lines 1-11, lines 63-67 and col. 10, lines 1-18).

As per claim **3**, Courts discloses the user specific information comprising at least one of:

- a record of views accessible to the remote user, a record of views recently displayed to the remote user, a record of folders recently accessed by the remote user, a record of URLs for folders commonly accessed by the remote user, a record of messages and/or folders moved and/or copied by the remote user and email addresses for the remote user (col. 4, lines 20-369 and col. 7, lines 44-52).

As per claims **4** and **28**, Courts discloses the state information comprising at least one of:

Art Unit: 2157

- a record of one or more entities involved in a process requiring multiple requests from the remote user via the stateless protocol (col. 1, lines 25-36, col. 6, lines 62-67, col. 7, lines 1-8 and col. 9, lines 16-28).

As per claims 5 and 29, Courts discloses the entities comprising at least one of

- memory locations, folders, directories, messages, objects, processes, threads, records, files and data (col. 9, lines 63-67 and col. 10, lines 1-18).

As per claims 6 and 30, Courts discloses:

- wherein the stateless protocol is HTTP (col. 1, lines 25-27 and col. 6, lines 64-67).

As per claims 7 and 31, Courts discloses the application comprising at least one of:

- email, chat sessions, database programs, video games., web-enabled applications and search engines (col. 6, lines 31-39).

As per claim 8, Courts discloses:

- wherein the application is Microsoft Exchange (col. 3, lines 20-29).

As per claim 9, Courts discloses:

- wherein the user specific information and the state information are stored in a user context object (abstract, col. 1, lines 45-62, col. 9, lines 1-11, lines 63-67 and col. 10, lines 1-18).

As per claim 10, Courts discloses:

- wherein the user context object is assigned a globally unique identifier (col. 6, lines 31-36, col. 9, lines 63-67 and col. 10, lines 1-18).

As per claim 11, Courts discloses:

Art Unit: 2157

- wherein the memory managing component manages one or more users context objects (col. 6, lines 31-36, col. 9, lines 63-67 and col. 10, lines 1-18).

As per claim 12, Courts discloses:

- wherein the memory managing component can locate a user context via an addressing algorithm, the algorithm employing the globally unique identifier, a locale identifier, a mailbox identifier and a security identifier (col. 6, lines 50-61).

As per claim 13, Courts discloses:

- wherein the memory managing component reclaims resources allocated to a user context object upon a determination that the user context object has not been accessed within a pre-determined threshold period of time, the resources including at least one of memory, data communications devices, processor and network bandwidth (col. 7, lines 4-12, lines 52-58 and col. 9, lines 53-61).

As per claim 15, Courts discloses:

- wherein the pre-determined threshold period of time can be dynamically changed based, at least in part, on feedback concerning the usage of one or more user context objects (col. 5, lines 35-43, col. 6, lines 9-19, col. 7, lines 4-12, lines 52-58, col. 9, lines 53-67 and col. 10, lines 1-18).

As per claim 16, Courts further discloses

- a monitoring component, operable to feedback information concerning usage of one or more user context objects (col. 5, lines 35-43, col. 6, lines 9-19, col. 9, lines 63-67 and col. 10, lines 1-18).

As per claim 17, Courts discloses:

Art Unit: 2157

- wherein more resources are allocated to a user context object when the feedback information indicates that the user context object has been utilized more than a first pre-determined threshold level (col. 5, lines 35-43, col. 6, lines 9-19, col. 7, lines 4-12, lines 52-58, col. 9, lines 53-67 and col. 10, lines 1-18).

As per claim **19**, Courts discloses:

- wherein the resources are reclaimed from a user context objects when the feedback information indicates that the user context object has been utilized less than a second pre-determined threshold level (col. 5, lines 35-43, col. 6, lines 9-19, col. 7, lines 4-12, lines 52-58, col. 9, lines 53-67 and col. 10, lines 1-18).

As per claims **18** and **20**, Courts discloses the resources comprising at least of:

- memory, processor time, communication devices and network bandwidth (col. 7, lines 4-12, lines 52-58 and col. 9, lines 53-61).

As per claims **23** and **39**, Courts discloses:

- selectively reclaiming the memory allocated to cache the state and/or user specific information associated with the remote access, the reclaiming occurring upon the allocated memory not being accessed within a pre-determined period of time (col. 5, lines 35-43, col. 6, lines 9-19, col. 7, lines 4-12, lines 52-58, col. 9, lines 53-67 and col. 10, lines 1-18).

As per claims **14** and **24**, Courts discloses:

- wherein the pre-determined threshold period of time is one hour (col. 7, lines 4-12, lines 52-58 and col. 9, lines 53-61).

As per claim **25**, Courts discloses:

Art Unit: 2157

- the pre-determined period of time being dynamically adjustable based, at least in part on feedback concerning the usage of the allocated memory associated with the remote access (col. 7, lines 4-12, lines 52-58 and col. 9, lines 53-61).

As per claim **26**, Courts further discloses:

- assigning a globally unique identifier to the memory allocated to cache the state and/or user specific information (col. 6, lines 31-36, col. 9, lines 63-67 and col. 10, lines 1-18).

As per claim **27**, Courts further discloses:

- locating the state and/or user specific information via an algorithm, the algorithm employing the globally unique identifier, a locale identifier, a mailbox identifier and a security identifier (col. 6, lines 50-61).

As per claim **32**, Courts further discloses:

- receiving feedback information concerning usage of one or more user context objects (col. 5, lines 35-43, col. 6, lines 9-19, col. 9, lines 63-67 and col. 10, lines 1-18); and
- allocating, more resources to a user context object, based at least in part, on the feedback information (col. 5, lines 35-43, col. 6, lines 9-19, col. 9, lines 63-67 and col. 10, lines 1-18).

As per claim **33**, Courts further discloses:

- de-allocating resources from a user context object, based at least in part, on the feedback information (col. 5, lines 35-43, col. 6, lines 9-19, col. 9, lines 63-67 and col. 10, lines 1-18).

As per claims **21** and **34**, Courts discloses:



Art Unit: 2157

- wherein the resources are shifted between one or more user context objects based, at least in part on feedback information (col. 5, lines 35-43, col. 6, lines 9-19, col. 9, lines 63-67 and col. 10, lines 1-18).

As per claim 40, Courts further discloses:

- computer executable instructions operable to dynamically reallocate resources to and/or from one or more user context objects based, at least in part, on feedback information received from one or more monitoring components (col. 5, lines 35-43, col. 6, lines 9-19, col. 9, lines 63-67 and col. 10, lines 1-18).

As per claim 41, Courts discloses a system for managing information in an application accessed via a stateless protocol comprising:

- means for allocating memory to store state and/or user specific information associated with a remote user access of an application, the application being accessed via a stateless protocol (abstract, col. 1, lines 45-62, col. 9, lines 1-11, lines 63-67 and col. 10, lines 1-18);
- means for caching, in the allocated memory state information associated with the remote access of the application (abstract, col. 1, lines 45-62, col. 9, lines 1-11, lines 63-67 and col. 10, lines 1-18);
- means for caching, in the allocated memory, user specific information associated with a remote accessor of the application (abstract, col. 1, lines 45-62, col. 9, lines 1-11, lines 63-67 and col. 10, lines 1-18); and

Art Unit: 2157

- means for locating the state and/or user specific information cached in the allocated memory (abstract, col. 1, lines 45-62, col. 9, lines 1-11, lines 63-67 and col. 10, lines 1-18).
- means for reclaiming the allocated memory, when the memory has not been accessed within a pre-determined period of time (col. 7, lines 4-12, lines 52-58 and col. 9, lines 53-61).

### *Response to Arguments*

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-41 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### **The Office notes the following arguments:**

- a. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as having insufficient antecedent basis. It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason. Claim 6 depends from claim 1, which recites "...a remote user accessing an application across a stateless protocol..."
- b. Bertis does disclose a suggest caching state and/or user specific information.
- c. The combination of Bertis and Himmel does not teach or suggest all claim limitations as recited in the subject claims.

#### **In response to:**

- (a) The Examiner withdraws the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections for claim 6.
- (b)-(c), Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection

Art Unit: 2157

*Conclusion*


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LaShonda T. Jacobs whose telephone number is 703-305-7494. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 703-308-7562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LaShonda T. Jacobs  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2157

ltj  
July 13, 2004

  
ARIO ETIENNE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100